

Newspaper	NEW STRAITS TIMES
Date	5 AUGUST 2016

Dr M won't renew bid to quiz PM

NST- 5/8/2016

ANOTHER CHANCE: He and 2 others can still raise issue in Najib's striking-out application, implies lawyer

HIDIR REDUAN
KUALA LUMPUR

hidirreduan@nst.com.my

TUN Dr Mahathir Mohamad and two others will not renew their bid to question Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Razak over his alleged contradictory affidavit that backs his application to strike out a lawsuit linked to the 1Malaysia Development Bhd (1MDB) issue.

This was revealed by lawyer

Muhammad Rafique Rashid Ali after yesterday's High Court case management of the suit by former prime minister Dr Mahathir and two others against Najib.

Rafique, who acted for Dr Mahathir and the other plaintiffs, said his clients felt the bid to cross-examine Najib was closely linked to Najib's application to strike out the suit.

"We will go through the same motion again," said Rafique, who also

acted for former Batu Kawan Umno vice-chief Datuk Seri Khairuddin Abu Hassan and former Langkawi Wanita Umno member Anina Saadudin, the two co-plaintiffs.

On July 27, the High Court dismissed an application by the three plaintiffs to cross-examine Najib, who is also Umno president.

The plaintiffs claimed that Najib's affidavit contained contradictory statements over whether he was a public officer.

Rafique, however, implied that his clients could still raise the issue during the hearing of Najib's striking-out bid, saying: "We have a second bite of the cherry."

Datuk Mohd Hafarizam Harun, who appeared for Najib during the proceedings in the chambers of judge Abu Bakar Jais, said that the court had set Nov 7 to hear his client's striking-out application.

On March 23, Dr Mahathir, Khairuddin and Anina filed the suit

against Najib.

The plaintiffs are suing Najib over alleged abuse of power to obstruct investigation into 1MDB, involving the remittance of RM2.6 billion and RM42 million into Najib's personal account, among others.

Najib had, on April 19, filed the application to strike out the trio's suit on grounds that there were no elements of tort of misfeasance and breach of fiduciary duties in public office, as they had claimed.